

Accepted for publication in The Astrophysical Journal Letters

Analysis of the Hipparcos Measurements of ν Andromedae — A Mass Estimate of its Outermost Known Planetary Companion

Tsevi Mazeh and Shay Zucker

School of Physics and Astronomy, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences,
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
mazeh@wise7.tau.ac.il; shay@wise.tau.ac.il

Andrea Dalla Torre¹ and Floor van Leeuwen

Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK
fvl@ast.cam.ac.uk; torre@ast.cam.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

We present an analysis of Hipparcos astrometric measurements of ν And, a nearby main-sequence star around which three planet candidates have recently been discovered by means of radial-velocity measurements. The stellar orbit associated with the outermost candidate has a period of 1269 ± 9 days and a minimum semi-major axis of 0.6 milli-arc-sec (mas). Using the Hipparcos data *together* with the spectroscopic elements we found a semi-major axis of 1.4 ± 0.6 mas. This implies a mass of $10.1^{+4.7}_{-4.6}$ Jupiter masses for that planet of ν And.

Subject headings: astrometry — planetary systems — stars: individual
(ν Andromedae)

¹ On leave from the University of Padova

1. INTRODUCTION

About twenty candidates for extrasolar planets have been announced over the past four years (e.g., Mayor & Queloz 1995; Noyes et al. 1997; Marcy & Butler 1998). In each case, very precise stellar radial-velocity measurements, with a precision of 10 m s^{-1} or better, indicated the presence of a low-mass unseen companion orbiting a nearby solar-type star. These high-precision discoveries came almost a decade after the first ‘planet candidate’ around HD 114762 was discovered (Latham et al. 1989; Mazeh, Latham & Stefanik 1996) with much lower precision. In all cases, the individual masses of the companions are not known, because the inclination angles of their orbital planes relative to our line of sight cannot be derived from the spectroscopic data. The minimum masses for all candidates, attained for an inclination angle of 90° , are in the range 0.5 to 10 Jupiter masses (M_J).

Although the only feature that characterized the ‘planet candidates’ was the smallness of their mass, no *direct* mass estimates were available. The near consensus on their nature as planets (e.g., Boss 1996; Mazeh, Goldberg & Latham 1998; Marcy & Butler 1998; but see Black 1997) was based only on statistical arguments. It relied on the fact that for orbital planes randomly oriented in space, the expectation value of the sine of the inclination angle is close to unity. Still, the mass estimation of individual planet candidates is extremely important. First, we want to know what is the actual mass range of the newly discovered objects. Some of the known candidates might have low inclinations and therefore substantially larger masses than their minimum masses. Second, the growing population of known extra-solar planets is starting to reveal interesting features, like non-zero eccentricity (e.g., Marcy & Butler 1998; see also Mazeh, Mayor & Latham 1996) and unexpectedly close orbits (e.g., Marcy, Cochran & Mayor 2000). To find whether and how these features depend on the planet mass we need better estimates of their masses. The spectroscopic data cannot yield any information beyond the *minimum* mass. We need additional information, like precise astrometry of the orbit, from which we can derive the inclination, and therefore the secondary mass, at least for the cases where the primary mass can be estimated from its spectral type.

At present, the astronomical community has at hand the accurate astrometric Hipparcos data, which have already yielded numerous orbits with small semi-major axes (ESA 1997; Söderhjelm 1999). The newly discovered planets are expected to induce reflex motion on their primary stars with semi-major axes of the order of 1 milli-arc-sec (mas) or smaller, below the detection threshold of the satellite. However, the spectroscopic elements yield only lower limit to the semi-major axis. The actual semi-major axis of the astrometric orbit is inversely proportional to the sine of the inclination angle, and therefore can be large enough to be detectable by the Hipparcos observations. Furthermore, the use

of the radial-velocity orbital elements, the orbital period in particular, can improve our astrometric detection limit significantly. Moreover, even if the orbit is too small for definite detection by Hipparcos, any upper limit of the astrometric orbit which is not substantially larger than the minimum semi-major axis has its own astrophysical significance.

Perryman et al. (1996) applied this approach to 47 UMa, 70 Vir and 51 Peg, using the Hipparcos data to put upper limits on the masses of their unseen companions. Their 90% confidence limit for the three planet-candidates were 22, 65, and 1100 M_J , respectively. Another opportunity to utilize this approach came recently, when Butler et al. (1999) announced their discovery of three planets around ν And (=HD 9826=HR 458=HIP 7513). The most distant known planet candidate of that system induces stellar orbital motion with semi-major axis that can be no smaller than about 0.6 mas — a lower limit not terribly smaller than the detection threshold of Hipparcos. Hipparcos measured the (one-dimensional) astrometric position of ν And on 27 independent reference circles, each circle providing two partially independent reduction results (see, for example, Perryman et al. 1997; van Leeuwen 1997). We hoped to get a relatively small upper limit for the semi-major axis, because the goodness-of-fit statistic given for ν And in the Hipparcos catalogue (F2 in column 30) has a value of 0.08, which does not indicate the presence of any unresolved orbital motion.

Our analysis is based on a method described by van Leeuwen and Evans (1998), a technique which was further developed for the use on astrometric orbits by two of us — ADT and FvL. The method refers back to the intermediate astrometric data (the abscissa residuals), which are fitted with a model of the apparent motion of the star through the optimization of a number of parameters (Dalla Torre and van Leeuwen, in prep). With these advanced methods at hand, we set out to reanalyze the 54 Hipparcos data points of ν And. This paper reports on our results.

2. The Hipparcos Astrometry

The analysis used the spectroscopic elements of the “updated Lick data orbit” as presented by Laughlin & Adams (1999, see also Butler et al. 1999). These included the spectroscopic period, $P = 1269 \pm 8.5$ day, the periastron passage, $T_0 = 2453813 \pm 32$, the radial-velocity amplitude, $K = 69.5 \pm 2.1$ m s $^{-1}$, and eccentricity $e = 0.30 \pm 0.05$, and the longitude of the periastron, $\omega = 236 \pm 15$. The orbital astrometric elements include P , T_0 , e , ω and three additional elements — the semi-major axis, a_1 , the inclination, i , and the longitude of the nodes, Ω . In addition, the astrometric solution includes the five regular astrometric parameters — the parallax, the position (in right ascension and declination) and

the proper motion (in right ascension and declination). All together we had 12 parameter model to fit to the astrometric data, four of which are common with the spectroscopic orbit.

To find the best astrometric orbit we used the values of P, T_0, e, ω as given by the spectroscopic orbit, and solved for the other parameters. To do that we considered a dense grid on the (a_1, i) plane, and found the values of the five regular astrometric parameters and Ω that minimized the χ^2 statistics for each value of (a_1, i) . The result of this search is a χ^2 *function*, which depends on a_1 and i . The square-root normalized χ^2 is plotted in Figure 1 as a two-dimensional function.

To our surprise we found a very pronounced “valley” at about 1.4 mas, indicating a detection of an astrometric motion. The valley runs across all possible inclinations, indicating that the analysis so far could derive the semi-major axis but not the inclination. This is probably due to the small amplitude of the astrometric motion and because the Hipparcos satellite did not measure any two-dimensional stellar position, but only a projected stellar position on the instantaneous reference circle of the satellite.

To derive the best inclination for the system we used another spectroscopic element — the radial-velocity amplitude K , which has not been used so far in the analysis. This element induces a constraint on the product of a_1 and $\sin i$, which for the v And case results in

$$a_1 \times \sin i = 0.56 \pm 0.02 \left(\frac{P}{1269 \text{ day}} \right) \left(\frac{K}{69.5 \text{ m s}^{-1}} \right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{0.95} \right) \left(\frac{\pi}{74.25 \text{ mas}} \right) \text{ mas} , \quad (1)$$

where we have used here the Hipparcos *catalog* parallax, $\pi = 74.25 \pm 0.72$ mas. This constraint is plotted in Figure 1 as a continuous line both on the (a_1, i) plane and on the square-root normalized χ^2 surface. In Figure 2 we collapsed the two-dimensional function onto the line of Eq. (1). We got a clear minimum at $156^\circ 0$. This corresponded to a semi-major axis of 1.4 mas and a mass of $10.1 M_J$. From Figure 2 we could also derive a 1σ range of inclinations — $[131^\circ 4, 163^\circ 9]$ which resulted in

$$a_1 = 1.4 \pm 0.6 \text{ mas} , \quad M_p = 10.1^{+4.7}_{-4.6} M_J , \quad (2)$$

where M_p is the mass of the outermost planet. We give the upper and the lower limit of the planet mass to emphasize the non-symmetric distribution of the errors. This is more pronounced when we move to the 2σ range, $[14^\circ 1, 167^\circ 9]$, which includes the 90° inclination angle. We therefore can not rule out, on the 2σ significance level, the minimum mass of $4.1 M_J$. At the 2σ level we therefore get

$$a_1 = 1.4^{+1.3}_{-0.8} \text{ mas} \quad , \quad M_p = 10.1^{+9.5}_{-6.0} M_J . \quad (3)$$

3. Discussion

The star ν And is the first solar-type star around which a system of three planet candidates was discovered. Before the recent discovery of Butler et al. (1999) only the pulsar PSR B1257+12 was known to have three planets (Wolszczan 1994). Unlike other planet candidates around main-sequence stars, where the nature of the companions is still in some doubt (e.g., Black 1997), the multiplicity of the ν And system strongly indicates that the companions are “proper” planets. This is so because we have here one massive object, the parent star, and another three small objects, with mass ratios of the order of $10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$, orbiting around the large object. The multiplicity of the small objects is believed to be one of the key features that characterizes planetary systems. Therefore, an estimate of the mass of one of the companions of ν And is important. The analysis of this paper indicates that the mass of the outermost planet is $10.1^{+4.7}_{-4.6} M_J$. This suggests that planet masses could be substantially larger than $1 M_J$.

The discussion so far has concentrated on the planet with the longest orbital period. If the three planets of ν And all have the same inclination, we can estimate the masses of the other two planets too. We get 1.8 ± 0.8 and $4.9 \pm 2.3 M_J$ for the first and the second planet, respectively. These estimates *assume* that the orbital planes of all three planets are aligned. However, it is not clear that this is the case. It is true that the orbital planes of the two outer planets cannot have very different inclination angles, because a large relative angle between their planes of motion makes their orbits dynamically unstable (e.g., Mazeh, Krymolowski & Rosenfeld 1997; Holman, Touma & Tremaine 1997; Krymolowski & Mazeh 1999). However, small angles, like $10^\circ - 20^\circ$, can not be excluded.

The stability of the planetary system around ν And got much attention in the last few months. A few numerical studies have been performed to find out if the system is stable on a long timescale (Laughlin & Adams 1999; Lissauer 1999; Lissauer & Rivera 1999; Noyes et al. 1999). All studies found that the stability strongly depends on the actual masses of the planets. This is so because the orbits of the second and third planets put them at a small distance from each other relative to their Hill radius, a proximity that makes their motion chaotic. The fact that the best estimate of this study for the mass of the third planet is $10 M_J$, instead of the $4 M_J$ minimum mass, makes the stability of the system even more questionable. Therefore, our findings necessitate additional careful surveys of the parameter space of the planetary system, to find stable enough configurations with $10 M_J$ third planet.

Such studies can put a firm upper limit to the mass of the outer planet.

In general, an ideal way to measure a companion mass would be to detect *independently* an astrometric modulation with the same orbital parameters as those of the spectroscopic solution. We do not yet have available the astrometric accuracy needed for such a detection. Instead, we used here the Hipparcos database *together* with the spectroscopic parameters to derive an astrometric orbit. We are studying now other planet candidates with our method, finding interesting results, for 70 Vir in particular. These results are deferred to a subsequent publication. Mayor reported in IAU Coll. 170 on a somewhat similar study done by Halbwachs et al. (in preparation), where they considered the brown-dwarf candidates found in the sample of nearby K and G stars (Mayor et al. 1997). Although the details of the Halbwachs et al. study are not yet published, Mayor reported that the study found the actual values of $\sin i$ of the orbits of their brown-dwarf companions to be substantially smaller than unity. According to that study, all the brown-dwarf candidates in their sample actually have stellar masses.

Obviously, we wait impatiently for the launch of SIM, whose planned capabilities will allow to detect independently the astrometric orbit of the *two* outermost companions of ν And with high S/N. In the meantime, while we hold our breath, we need to settle for the Hipparcos data, which allow only to detect motion induced by planets orbiting with long periods, of the order of a few years, around nearby main-sequence stars. As the time base of the radial-velocity measurements is getting longer, we expect more such planets to be discovered. We therefore expect in the next few years, even before the new instruments start to operate, a few more planets whose mass could be estimated.

We wish to express our deep gratitude to the referee, whose extremely useful comments and wise and thoughtful advice substantially improved this study. This work was supported by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation through grant 97-00460 and the Israeli Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Black, D. C. 1997, ApJL, 490, L171
- Boss, A. P. 1996, Nature, 379, 397
- Butler, R. P., Marcy, G. W., Fischer, D. A., Brown, T. W., Contos, A. R., Korzennik, S.G., Nisenson, P., & Noyes, R. W. 1999, ApJ, in press
- Holman, M., Touma, J., & Tremaine, S. 1997, Nature, 386, 254
- Krymowski, Y., & Mazeh, T. 1999, MNRAS, 304, 720
- Latham, D. W., Mazeh, T., Stefanik, R. P., Mayor, M., & Burki, G. 1989, Nature, 339, 38
- ESA 1997, The Hipparcos and Tycho Catalogues, ESA SP-1200
- Laughlin, G., & Adams, F.C. 1999, submitted for publication
- Lisauer, J.J. 1999, Nature, 398, 659
- Lisauer, J.J., & Rivera, E. 1999, submitted for publication
- van Leeuwen, F. 1997, Space Sc. Rev., 81, 201
- van Leeuwen, F., & Evans, D. W. 1998, A&AS, 130, 157
- Marcy, G.W., & Butler R. P. 1998, ARAA, 36, 57
- Marcy, G. W., Cochran, W. D., & Mayor, M. 2000, in Protostars and Planets IV, ed. V. Mannings, A. P. Boss & S. S. Russell (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), in press
- Mayor, M., & Queloz, D. 1995, Nature, 378, 355
- Mayor, M., Queloz, D., Udry, S., Halbwachs, J.-L. 1997, in IAU Coll. 161, Astronomical and Biochemical Origins and Search for Life in the Universe ed. C. B. Cosmovici, S. Boyer, & D. Werthimer (Bologna: Editrice Compositori) 313
- Mazeh, T., Goldberg, D., & Latham, D. W. 1998, ApJL,
- Mazeh T., Krymowski Y., Rosenfeld G., 1997, ApJL, 477, L103
- Mazeh, T., Latham, D. W., & Stefanik R. P. 1996, ApJ, 466, 415
- Mazeh, T., Mayor, M., & Latham D. W. 1996, ApJ, 478, 367

- Noyes, R. W., Jha, S., Korzennik, S. G., Krockenberger, M., Nisenson, P., Brown, T. M., Kennelly, E. J., & Horner, S. D. 1997, ApJL, 483, L111
- Noyes, R. W., Korzennik, S.G., Nisenson, P., Holman, M.J., Contos, A. R., & Brown, T. W. 1999, BAAS, in press
- Perryman, M. A. C., et al. 1996, A&A, 310, L21
- Perryman, M. A. C., et al. 1997, A&A, 323, L49
- Söderhjelm, S. 1999, A&A, 341, 121
- Wolszczan, A. 1994, Science, 264, 538

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1.— The minimum square-root normalized χ^2 statistics as a function of a_1 and i . The continuous line is the $a_1 \times \sin i = 0.56$ mas constraint.

Fig. 2.— The minimum square-root normalized χ^2 statistics as a function of i , given the constraint $a_1 \times \sin i = 0.56$ mas.



